



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1459
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/526,363	03/02/2005	Janne Liimatainen	3501-1095	3377

465 7590 01/06/2009
YOUNG & THOMPSON
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PACHURA, REBECCA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2436

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/06/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/526,363

Applicant(s)

LIIMATAINEN, JANNE

Examiner

Rebecca L. Pachura

Art Unit

2436

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-34 and 36-42 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-34 and 36-42 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The Figures 1 and 2 of the drawings were objected to because it is not obvious either by the drawing or the Brief Description of the Drawings that they are maps. However, if the applicant does not think that more extensively labeling them would be appropriate the Examiner will accept them as is.

Specification

2. The objection to the abstract is withdrawn based on the new abstract submitted on 10/20/2008. The amendment to the disclosure submitted on 10/20/2008 is accepted and the objection to the disclosure is withdrawn.

Claim Objections

3. The objections to claims 22-42 are withdrawn based on the amendments submitted on 10/20/2008. Claims 27, 31, 36, and 38 is objected to because of the following informalities: claims 27, 31, 36, and 38, line 1 states "The A" it should state "The A" or states "The An" it should state "The An". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. **Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claim 33 recites the limitation "the use" in line 26. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In claim 33 it states "adapting the mobile terminal for the use by" it is unclear to the examiner what use the mobile terminal is being adapted to since no use has been disclosed.

Status of Claims

5. **Claims 21-34 and 36-42 are pending in this Office Action.**
Claims 21-34 and 36-42 are amended.
Claim 35 is canceled.

Response to Amendment

6. **The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection on claims 26, 27, 33, and 37 is withdrawn based on the applicant's amendments submitted on 10/20/2008. The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection on claim 41 is not withdrawn.** In claim 41, line 11 it states "the decryption key" and in line 15 it states "the selected decryption key" if the applicant is referring to "the location-specific decryption key" and/or "the location-specific

selected decryption key" then these two lines need to be amended. If the applicant is not referring to "the location-specific decryption key" and/or "the location-specific selected decryption key" then there is a lack of antecedent basis.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/20/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's Invention as claimed:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 21-34 and 36-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5243652 (Teare), in view of US 20020078361 (Giroux), and in view of US 6674860 (Pirila).**

As to claim 21, (currently amended) Teare discloses a method for adapting a mobile terminal to a use in a communication system comprising at least a communication network and a location service in the communication network, the method comprising at least: maintaining location-specific decryption keys in a server (Teare column 1, lines 40-57). Teare does not explicitly teach providing the mobile terminal with data divided into several parts, each part

concerning data connected to a certain area and being encrypted at least by a location-specific key.

However, Giroux discloses providing the mobile terminal with data divided into several parts, each part concerning data connected to a certain area and being encrypted at least by a location-specific key (Giroux page 1, paragraph 0014).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine Teare and Giroux because they both teach providing location specific decryption keys (Giroux page 7, paragraph 0079).

The modified Teare discloses transporting location information on the mobile terminal from ~~a~~ the location service in the communication network to the server; checking whether or not the location information on the mobile terminal matches to location information on one of said location-specific decryption keys; sending a location-specific decryption key to the mobile terminal if the location information on the mobile terminal matches to the location information on said location-specific decryption key; and adapting the mobile terminal for use by decrypting the part to which said location-specific decryption key matches (Teare column 1, lines 40-57).

As to claim 22, (currently amended) Teare discloses ~~a~~ the method according to claim 21, wherein prior to sending the location-specific decryption key, the mobile terminal requests the location-specific decryption key from the server (Teare column 3, lines 44-47).

As to claim 23, (currently amended) the modified Teare discloses ~~a~~ the method according to claim 21. The modified Teare does not explicitly teach wherein the server requests location information from the location service.

However, Giroux discloses wherein the server requests location information from the location service (Giroux page 5, paragraph 0050).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine Teare and Giroux because they both teach a remote server that determines who gets a decryption key based on who is authorized (Giroux page 5, paragraph 0050).

As to claim 24, (currently amended) the modified Teare discloses **a the** method according to claim 21. The modified Teare does not explicitly teach further comprising requesting the location information from the mobile terminal and, as a response to said enquiry, the mobile terminal transports the requested location information to the server.

However, Giroux discloses further comprising requesting the location information from the mobile terminal and, as a response to said enquiry, the mobile terminal transports the requested location information to the server (Giroux page 5, paragraph 0050).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine Teare and Giroux because they both teach a remote server that determines who gets a decryption key based on who is authorized (Giroux page 5, paragraph 0050).

As to claim 25, (currently amended) Teare discloses **a the** method according to claim 21, further comprising performing said checking of matching and said sending of said location-specific decryption keys automatically by utilizing location information received by the server (Teare column 3, lines 30-35).

As to claim 26, (currently amended) Teare discloses **a the** method according to claim 21, wherein the location service utilizes the location information on the mobile terminal, which

location information is within ~~the~~ knowledge of the communication network (Teare column 2, lines 36-49).

As to claim 27, (currently amended) Teare discloses ~~a~~ the method according to claim 24, wherein the mobile terminal utilizes the location information on the mobile terminal, which location information is within ~~the~~ knowledge of the communication network (Teare column 2, lines 36-49).

As to claim 28, (currently amended) Teare discloses ~~a~~ the method according to claim 21, further comprising checking identification information on the mobile terminal along with the location information before sending the location-specific decryption key to the mobile terminal (Teare column 1, lines 40-57: signature data).

As to claim 29, (currently amended) Teare discloses ~~a~~ the method according to claim 21, further comprising checking time information along with the location information before sending the location-specific decryption key to the mobile terminal (Teare column 1, lines 40-57: signature data).

As to claim 30, (currently amended) Teare discloses ~~a~~ the method according to claim 21, further comprising checking identification information on the mobile terminal and time information along with the location information before sending the location-specific decryption key to the mobile terminal (Teare column 1, lines 40-57).

As to claim 31, (currently amended) the modified Teare discloses ~~a~~ the method according to claim 21. The modified Teare does not explicitly teach further comprising transporting location-specific decryption keys for several parts to the mobile terminal for adapting the mobile terminal.

However, Giroux discloses further comprising transporting location-specific decryption keys for several parts to the mobile terminal for adapting the mobile terminal (Giroux page 1, paragraph 0014).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine Teare and Giroux because they both teach providing location specific decryption keys (Giroux page 7, paragraph 0079).

As to claim 32, (currently amended) Teare discloses **a the method** according to claim 21, wherein the adaptation is made for a current use (Teare column 2, lines 11-50).

As to claim 33, (currently amended) Teare discloses an arrangement for adapting a mobile terminal to a use **in a communication system comprising at least a communication network and a location service in the communication network**, the arrangement comprising: (Teare column 1, lines 40-57). Teare does not explicitly teach first means **for** comprising data, divided into several parts, each part concerning data connected to a certain area and being encrypted by a location-specific key.

However, Giroux discloses first means **for** comprising data, divided into several parts, each part concerning data connected to a certain area and being encrypted by a location-specific key (Giroux page 1, paragraph 0014).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine Teare and Giroux because they both teach providing location specific decryption keys (Giroux page 7, paragraph 0079).

The modified Teare discloses a server arranged to be in connection with a location service through **a the communication network**, the server comprising: location-specific

decryption keys; second means for finding out a location information on of the mobile terminal from a the location service in the communication network; third means ~~(314)~~ for comparing the found out location information on the mobile terminal and the location information on said location-specific decryption keys, and selecting ~~the a~~ location-specific decryption key whose location information matches to the location information on the mobile terminal; fourth means for sending ~~the a~~ selected decryption key to the mobile terminal, ~~the fourth means~~ and being responsive to ~~the said~~ third means (Teare column 1, lines 40-57). The modified Teare does not explicitly disclose wherein the mobile terminal is connectable to the first means for adapting the mobile terminal for the use by providing the mobile terminal with data divided into several parts and the mobile terminal comprises fifth means for decrypting a part by using the location-specific decryption key.

However, Giroux discloses wherein the mobile terminal is connectable to the first means for adapting the mobile terminal for the use by providing the mobile terminal with data divided into several parts and the mobile terminal comprises fifth means for decrypting a part by using the location-specific decryption key (Giroux page 1, paragraph 0014).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine Teare and Giroux because they both teach providing location specific decryption keys (Giroux page 7, paragraph 0079).

As to claim 34, (currently amended) Teare discloses ~~an~~ the arrangement according to claim 33, wherein the mobile terminal further comprises sixth means for requesting a location-specific decryption key from the server (Teare column 3, lines 44-47).

As to claim 36, (currently amended) Teare discloses ~~an~~ the arrangement according to claim 33, wherein the second means comprises means for requesting location information on the mobile terminal and means for receiving the requested information (Teare Figure 2).

As to claim 37, (currently amended) the modified Teare discloses ~~an~~ the arrangement according to claim 33. The modified Teare does not explicitly teach wherein the location-specific decryption keys are further associated with at least one of the time information and identification information on mobile phones, to be used along with the location information when a location-specific decryption key is selected.

However, Pirila discloses wherein the location-specific decryption keys are further associated with at least one of the time information and identification information on mobile phones, to be used along with the location information when a location-specific decryption key is selected (Pirila column 10, lines 23-39 and Figure 4).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine Teare and Pirila because they both teach transferring decryption keys based on location information (Pirila column 10, lines 23-39 and Figure 4).

As to claim 38, (currently amended) the modified Teare discloses ~~an~~ the arrangement according to claim 33. The modified Teare does not explicitly teach wherein the mobile terminal is one of a group comprising a field computer, PDA, and mobile phone.

However, Pirila discloses wherein the mobile terminal is one of a group comprising a field computer, PDA, and mobile phone (Pirila column 8, lines 12-30 and Figure 9).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine Teare and Pirila because they both teach transferring decryption keys based on location information (Pirila column 8, lines 12-30 and Figure 9).

As to claim 39, (currently amended) the modified Teare discloses ~~an~~ the arrangement according to claim 36. The modified Teare does not explicitly teach wherein the location service is arranged to utilize location information from a mobile phone network.

However, Pirila discloses wherein the location service is arranged to utilize location information from a mobile phone network (Pirila column 1, lines 35-45).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine Teare and Pirila because they both teach transferring decryption keys based on location information (Pirila column 1, lines 35-45).

As to claim 40, (currently amended) the modified Teare discloses ~~an~~ the arrangement according to claim 33. The modified Teare does not explicitly teach wherein ~~the~~ said fourth means is further arranged to send, in response to ~~the~~ said third means, location-specific decryption keys for several parts for adapting the mobile terminal.

However, Giroux discloses wherein ~~the~~ said fourth means is further arranged to send, in response to ~~the~~ said third means, location-specific decryption keys for several parts for adapting the mobile terminal (Giroux page 1, paragraph 0014).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine Teare and Giroux because they both teach providing location specific decryption keys (Giroux page 7, paragraph 0079).

As to claim 41, (currently amended) Teare discloses a server for a communication system comprising at least a mobile terminal, ~~a location service~~ and a communication network, the server being arranged to be connectable to the location service via the communication network and a location service in the communication network, the server comprising: location-specific decryption keys; first means for finding out a location information on ~~of~~ the mobile terminal from the location service; second means for comparing ~~the found out~~ location information on the mobile terminal and the location information on said location-specific decryption keys, and for selecting the decryption key whose location information matches to the location information on the mobile terminal; and third means for, responsive to the second means, ~~for~~ sending the selected decryption key to the mobile terminal (Teare column 1, lines 40-57).

As to claim 42, (currently amended) Teare discloses a mobile terminal for a communication system comprising at least a server, a location service and a communication network, the mobile terminal being arranged to be connectable to the server via the communication network, the mobile terminal comprising (Teare column 1, lines 40-57, Figure 1, and Figure 2). Teare does not explicitly teach first means for comprising data divided into several parts, each part concerning data connected to a certain area, and being encrypted by a location-specific key; second means for receiving at least one location-specific decryption key from the server; and third means for decrypting a part by using at the least one location-specific decryption key.

However, Giroux discloses first means for comprising data divided into several parts, each part concerning data connected to a certain area, and being encrypted by a location-specific

key second means for receiving at least one location-specific decryption key from the server; and third means for decrypting a part by using at the least one location-specific decryption key (Giroux page 1, paragraph 0014).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine Teare and Giroux because they both teach providing location specific decryption keys (Giroux page 7, paragraph 0079).

Remarks

9. Applicant has presented amendments for the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection, has canceled 1 claim, and has made some amendments for clarification. Applicant has made arguments for the rest of the response, see below.

The Applicant Argues:

The following features of claims 21, and the corresponding features of claims 33 and 42, are neither taught nor suggested: -a data connected to a certain area being encrypted; and - a mobile terminal adapted for use by decrypting the data/information. Further, the applied art does not teach or suggest the following feature of claim 21, and the corresponding features of claims 33, 41, and 41: - location information on the mobile terminal transported from the location service in the communication network to the server. As each independent claim is non-obvious, the dependent claims are non-obvious.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

That Giroux discloses -a data connected to a certain area being encrypted (Giroux page 1, paragraph 0014 and page 7, paragraph 0079). Teare discloses “and - a mobile terminal adapted for use by decrypting the data/information” and “- location information on the mobile terminal transported from the location service in the communication network to the server” (Teare column 1, lines 40-57). The dependent claims are also rejected because they depend from rejected independent claims.

The Applicant Argues:

TEARE does not teach a data connected to a certain area being encrypted, a mobile terminal adapted for use by decrypting the data/information, or location information on the mobile terminal transported from the location service in the communication network to the server.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

As stated above Teare does disclose “a data connected to a certain area being encrypted, a mobile terminal adapted for use by decrypting the data/information, or location information on the mobile terminal transported from the location service in the communication network to the server” because in column 1, lines 40-57 Teare states that “and means for comparing the location history to said predetermined signature data, and forwarding the corresponding key to said mobile node if the comparison satisfies a match condition”; in other words when the mobile device is in a specific area the decryption key is transmitted to it. Furthermore, Teare column 3, lines 30-38 states that “Accordingly, facility 12 includes a means for comparing the received

location history from node 11 to the predetermined location histories in the database. If a match condition is satisfied, then authorization is granted, and the key associated with the matched predetermined history is released for transmission to node 11. The node 11 is suitably equipped with a signal procession system for decoding the encrypted signal using the received code decryption key”; in other words a mobile terminal is adapted for use by decrypting the data/information. And, Teare column 1, lines 40-57 states “the mobile node includes a receiver means for acquiring actual position information...and transmission means for communicating said position information to the central facility”; the applicant does not state that the positioning system data could not be transmitted through the mobile node since the mobile node and the server are on the same communications network.

The Applicant Argues:

GIROUX discloses that the decrypted information is viewed by a user, and that the electronic information may be video, audio, pictorial, or electronic data. Further, GIROUX teaches that geographical positioning data can be provided by a GPS or LORAN device used with the viewing tool (user equipment). Thus, GIROUX teaches to find out the location information from a mobile station which is contrary to the claimed feature in which the server finds out location information on the mobile station from a location service in a network.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

As discussed above the applicant does not state that the positioning system data could not be transmitted through the mobile node since the mobile node and the server are on the same communications network. Furthermore, in Giroux it states that “the location device can be used

with the viewing tool...or external device" (Giroux page 7, paragraph 0079). In other words the external device is separate from the mobile device.

The Applicant Argues:

Further, as GIROUX teaches to find out the location information from a mobile station which is contrary to the claimed feature in which the server finds out location information on the mobile station from a location service in a network, it is improper to combine this reference with TEARE. The Federal circuit has held that it is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination. In re Grasselli, 713 F.2d 731, 743, 218 USPQ 769, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Also, "One cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention." In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 1075 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In an obviousness rejection, it is impermissible "to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art." In re Wesslau, 353 F.2d 238, 241 (CCPA 1965).

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

Please see arguments above.

The Applicant Argues:

PIRILA discloses that the encrypted information is the transmitted location information itself. Accordingly, PIRILA also does not teach a data connected to a certain area being encrypted, a mobile terminal adapted for use by decrypting the data/information, or location

information on the mobile terminal transported from the location service in the communication network to the server.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

Pirila (column 8, lines 21-26) discloses that "...the signal is processed in accordance with whether the information transmitted is speech or data...the location or other service data and the decryption key received from a base station are processed in a control unit...".

The Applicant Argues:

Thus, the Federal Circuit requires that in order to prevent the use of such hindsight, the Official Action must "show reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited prior art references for combination in the manner claimed." (In re Rouffett at 1458). The present rejection fails to meet this requirement.

The Federal Circuit has also held that in determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 USC 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The Federal Circuit has held that the mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In performing this obviousness analysis, the Examiner is required to make findings of fact and must provide an articulated reasoning supporting the rejection. The Examiner's

articulated reasoning in the rejection must possess a rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

The present rejection hasn't made sufficient proper findings of fact to support the rejection and rather relies on conclusory statements.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

That Giroux does teach the motivation to combine Teare and Giroux on page 1, paragraph 0014 Giroux states "The document or information may also be broken down into sections using the authoring tool 102, so that certain sections within a document may have different keys and/or access policies". In other words, by dividing the information into multiple sections allows the controlling party to determine who has access to specific information thereby increasing the security of the information (Giroux page 1, paragraph 0003).

Based on the examiner's arguments claims 21-34 and 36-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rebecca L. Pachura whose telephone number is (571) 270-3402. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 10:00 am-8:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on (571) 272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rebecca L. Pachura/
Examiner, Art Unit 2436

/Nasser G. Moazzami/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436